

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

IN RE:	Julie E. Rogers)
	Ward 058, Block 078, Parcel 00005) Shelby County
	Residential Property)
	Tax Year 2005)

INITIAL DECISION AND ORDER

Statement of the Case

The subject property is presently valued as follows:

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$11,900	\$50,500	\$62,400	\$15,600

An appeal has been filed on behalf of the property owner with the State Board of Equalization. The undersigned administrative judge conducted a hearing in this matter on February 15, 2006 in Memphis, Tennessee. In attendance at the hearing were Julie Rogers, the appellant, and Shelby County Property Assessor's representative Ron Palmer.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Subject property consists of a single family residence located at 3725 Philsdale in Memphis, Tennessee.

The taxpayer contended that subject property should be valued at \$31.66 or \$32.56 per square foot which equates to \$35,142 and \$36,142 respectively. In support of this position, fifteen comparable sales were introduced into evidence. The taxpayer maintained that since the pre-2005 sales sold for an average price of \$31.66 per square foot, subject property should be valued similarly. Alternatively, the taxpayer asserted that subject property should be valued at \$32.56 per square foot which was the average sale price of all fifteen sales.

The assessor contended that subject property should be valued at \$62,400. In support of this position, a spreadsheet summarizing five sales was introduced into evidence. Mr. Palmer's exhibit also contained photographs of the subject and comparables. Mr. Palmer noted that the current appraisal of subject property is actually somewhat below the range established by the comparable sales.

The basis of valuation as stated in Tennessee Code Annotated Section 67-5-601(a) is that "[t]he value of all property shall be ascertained from the evidence of its sound, intrinsic and immediate value, for purposes of sale between a willing seller and a willing buyer without consideration of speculative values . . ."

After having reviewed all the evidence in the case, the administrative judge finds that the subject property should be valued at \$62,400 as contended by the assessor of property.

Since the taxpayer is appealing from the determination of the Shelby County Board of Equalization, the burden of proof is on the taxpayer. See State Board of Equalization Rule 0600-1-.11(1) and *Big Fork Mining Company v. Tennessee Water Quality Control Board*, 620 S.W.2d 515 (Tenn. App. 1981).

The administrative judge finds that the taxpayer's sales cannot be adopted as the basis of valuation for at least two reasons. First, the sales were not adjusted. The administrative judge finds that the Assessment Appeals Commission addressed the need to adjust comparable sales in *E.B. Kissell, Jr.* (Shelby County, Tax Years 1991 and 1992) as follows:

The best evidence of the present value of a residential property is generally sales of properties comparable to the subject, comparable in features relevant to value. Perfect comparability is not required, but relevant differences should be explained and accounted for by reasonable adjustments. If evidence of a sale is presented without the required analysis of comparability, it is difficult or impossible for us to use the sale as an indicator of value. . . .

Final Decision and Order at 2. Second, the administrative judge finds it is inappropriate to simply average sales prices. As explained in one authoritative text:

In selecting the single value estimate, the assessor must never average the results. Rather, the process requires the assessor to review the adjustments made and place the greatest reliance on the most comparable property. This comparable is the one that requires the fewest adjustments. [Emphasis added.]

The administrative judge finds that the procedure normally followed in the sales comparison approach has been summarized in another authoritative text as follows:

To apply the sales comparison approach, an appraiser follows a systematic procedure.

1. Research the competitive market for information on sales transactions, listings, and offers to purchase or sell involving properties that are similar to the subject property in terms of characteristics such as property type, date of sale, size, physical condition, location, and land use constraints. The goal is to find a set of comparable sales as similar as possible to the subject property.
2. Verify the information by confirming that the data obtained is factually accurate and that the transactions reflect arm's-length, market considerations. Verification may elicit additional information about the market.
3. Select relevant units of comparison (e.g., price per acre, price per square foot, price per front foot) and develop a comparative analysis for each unit. The goal here is to define and identify a unit of comparison that explains market behavior.

4. Look for differences between the comparable sale properties and the subject property using the elements of comparison. Then *adjust the price of each sale property to reflect how it differs from the subject property or eliminate that property as a comparable*. This step typically involves using the most comparable sale properties and then adjusting for any remaining differences.
5. Reconcile the various value indications produced from the analysis of comparables into a single value indication or a range of values.

[Emphasis supplied]

Appraisal Institute, *The Appraisal of Real Estate* at 422 (12th ed. 2001).

In this case, the taxpayer's sales sold for anywhere from \$18 to \$49 per square foot. Presumably, some sales were distressed in nature or at least not arm's length transactions. Given the tremendous variation in sales prices, the administrative judge can only assume that the comparables encompass a wide variety of homes.

ORDER

It is therefore ORDERED that the following value and assessment be adopted for tax year 2005:

<u>LAND VALUE</u>	<u>IMPROVEMENT VALUE</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT</u>
\$11,900	\$50,500	\$62,400	\$15,600

It is FURTHER ORDERED that any applicable hearing costs be assessed pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501(d) and State Board of Equalization Rule 0600-1-.17.


Pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act, Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 4-5-301—325, Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501, and the Rules of Contested Case Procedure of the State Board of Equalization, the parties are advised of the following remedies:

1. A party may appeal this decision and order to the Assessment Appeals Commission pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501 and Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization. Tennessee Code Annotated § 67-5-1501(c) provides that an appeal **“must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date the initial decision is sent.”** Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization provides that the appeal be filed with the Executive Secretary of the State Board and that the appeal **“identify the allegedly erroneous finding(s) of fact and/or conclusion(s) of law in the initial order”**; or
2. A party may petition for reconsideration of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-317 within fifteen (15) days of the entry of the order. The petition for reconsideration must state the specific grounds upon which relief is requested. The filing of a petition for reconsideration is not a prerequisite for seeking administrative or judicial review; or

3. A party may petition for a stay of effectiveness of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-316 within seven (7) days of the entry of the order.

This order does not become final until an official certificate is issued by the Assessment Appeals Commission. Official certificates are normally issued seventy-five (75) days after the entry of the initial decision and order if no party has appealed.

ENTERED this 22nd day of February, 2006.



MARK J. MINSKY
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES DIVISION

c: Ms. Julie E. Rogers
Tameaka Stanton-Riley, Appeals Manager